# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Government.

v.

Case No. 10-20676

STEVEN DEMINK,

Defendant.

SENTENCE HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE GERALD E.ROSEN, Chief Judge
United States District Judge
733 US Courthouse & Federal Building
231 Lafayette Boulevard West
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Wednesday, August 3, 2011

#### APPEARANCES:

KEVIN MULCAHY
HALA Y. JARBOU
Assistant United States Attorneys
211 W. Fort Street
Detroit, MI 48226
On behalf of the Government.

TIMOTHY A. DINAN 14950 E. Jefferson Avenue Grosse Pointe Park, MI 48230 On behalf of the Defendant.

To Obtain a Certified Transcript: Carol S. Sapala, RMR, FCRR 313.961.7552 www.transcriptorders.com

$\overline{}$	$\sim$	N	т	177	Ν	Т	S
_	U	T/I		- L	T/I		

IDENTIFICATION PAGE

WITNESSES

None.

Sentence Hearing 5

Certificate of Court Reporter 59

E X H I B I T S

\_\_\_\_

IDENTIFICATION MARKED RECEIVED

None Marked

Case 2	:10-cr-20676-GER-VMM						
	Sentence Hearing 8-3-2011						
1	Detroit, Michigan						
2	Wednesday, August 3, 2011						
3	1:21 p.m.						
4	THE CLERK: The court will call criminal action						
5	10-20676, United States of America versus Steven						
6	Demink.						
7	THE COURT: Good afternoon. Appearances, please.						
8	MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor. Good afternoon.						
9	Kevin Mulcahy and Hala Jarbou on behalf of the United						
10	States.						
11	MR. DINAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Timothy						
12	Dinan on behalf of Mr. Demink who's present to my left.						
13	THE COURT: Mr. Dinan, if you and Mr. Demink would						
14	approach the podium, please.						
15	All right. Mr. Dinan, I would like you to confirm						
16	that you have had an opportunity to review the Presentence						
17	Report with Mr. Demink.						
18	MR. DINAN: I have Your Honor. We've also						
19	reviewed the government's brief and we presented the						
20	Court with our own memorandum.						
21	THE COURT: I've received that, including all 33						
22	of the attachments. I appreciate it.						
23	Do you have any objections that you wish to place on						
24	the record or comments concerning the Presentence Report?						
25	MR. DINAN: Judge, I've provided the government						

today with one more letter that wasn't included. It's from my, my client's sister. I would like to present it to the Court. I think it's relevant and should be part of the record.

THE COURT: I'll accept it.

MR. DINAN: May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may. Anything else concerning the

Presentence Report?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DINAN: Not the report, Your Honor, no.

THE COURT: Mr. Mulcahy, for the government?

MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor.

The government's received and reviewed the Presentence Report. We have no objections.

THE COURT: All right. Allocution on behalf of your client, Mr. Dinan.

MR. DINAN: Thank you, Judge.

Your Honor, as I present Mr. Demink today for sentencing, I just want to highlight what I've put in my brief what I think are the most important parts of it, judge.

Steve has no criminal record, no history of violence. He grew up and lived at home with his family most of his life, judge.

He's been gainfully employed, got along with people. He was a friend, an uncle, nephew, good neighbor. So I'm

trying to figure out, judge, what, what led Steve to do what he did.

THE COURT: I think everybody's trying to figure that out.

MR. DINAN: Well, judge, what I've reviewed from Dr. Miller's comments and the time I spent with Dr. Miller and Steve, it seems that there's a number of elements that come into play; loneliness, low self esteem, poor self image, rejection throughout his personal life, judge. I'm not just saying that as an excuse, but I'm trying to give you just a little insight of who he is.

Judge, he was using The Internet as a substitute for interpersonal contact. First, it started out everyone uses it for for information, for amusement, for entertainment. But then Steve was drawn more into personal isolation and the sexual intrigue of his own desires.

This isolation, this self delusion, I believe that's what led to this cynical set of transactions that brought him here today having plead guilty to what he was charged with.

Judge, his mental illness, his actions, coupled with the unmet needs and expectations of his victims is what really led to all of these tragedies.

As much at The Internet empowers people, Your Honor, it also uncovers our shortcomings our weaknesses.

Now the government claims in its brief that Steven Demink didn't care about his victims because he did not confess immediately when arrested.

Judge, he entered a guilty plea on all the counts that he's going to be sentenced on today because he knows he did something wrong.

Not only entered guilty pleas, but entered guilty pleas that could potentially put him in prison for the rest his life.

And in his work with Dr. Miller, he started to realize and understand his own weaknesses. But more importantly, the fact that his actions were the, were the cause for all the pain and all the bad things that have happened to the victims.

Dr. Miller notes Steve knows he needs psychological treatment and he's amenable to it.

And Dr. Miller doesn't predispose himself to predicting the future, but with the testing we had available, the length of time he spent with him, he saw Steve as someone who could be rehabilitated in the future.

Your Honor, I think that's a very important part of the decision the Court's going to have to make today.

He enjoys extraordinary support from friends and

1 | family, judge.

THE COURT: I gather that from the letters that I read.

MR. DINAN: Your Honor, those letters are heart felt. It would be very easy to turn a back on Steve, just leave him. He's not the kind of person people do that to.

I think, I think the letter I just gave you probably captures it best. Just little incidents from his life, kindnesses, just the way he conducted himself day-to-day. It's a total paradox to what he plead guilty to.

Now the way the guidelines are calculated, judge, he goes to prison for life. And if the justice system is there simply to demonize individuals and act as a justification for warehousing them, then it's a matter of calculation, judge. But there's more than that going on today.

And not for one moment I don't blame the victims for what happened to them nor does Steve.

Judge, there's good reasons to depart from the guidelines. First of all, he did not leave his household to commit these acts. He did not leave his place of residence to do this.

He didn't want to make personal contact with the victims. I'm not saying that's any less a crime, but it's

an important difference.

Because cases about these guidelines show us that it's the people who go out and actively seek physical contact, that's what they're being penalized for, judge. We don't have that here. We have a very unique situation. There were no weapons involved.

He's accepted responsibility for what he's done.

THE COURT: If I could just stop you and ask you to address this issue.

There were no weapons involved, but wasn't the computer, The Internet, used as a weapon?

MR. DINAN: Yes, judge. I understand what the Court's asking.

But I would say its -- it's like any, any other object that could be abused or used. And I understand what the Court's asking.

THE COURT: In this sense a car isn't a weapon in its ordinary every day use. But if somebody uses a car with the intent of causing great bodily injury or killing someone, then it is a weapon.

Isn't that how Mr. Demink used The Internet?

MR. DINAN: Judge, I would -- I could see where that argument's being made. I understand what's the Court's asking.

It is certainly -- I'll answer your question by

conceding it's something that could have been abused and was in this case.

THE COURT: Interesting that as technology progresses in whatever the arena, it seems that there are benefits but, also, opportunities for great disproportions and uses of ill intent. That's certainly true of the Internet.

MR. DINAN: I agree, Your Honor. Judge --

THE COURT: I didn't mean interrupt you.

MR. DINAN: I'm sorry, Judge.

I've known Steve since 1985 and in way I feel like he's my brother. And I'm here today with Steve and his family and friends who are all here with him, judge.

Because he's my brother, I'm angry at him. I'm angry for what he did, I can't believe that he had the capacity to do what he did.

We are all confused and disappointed about what Steve's done because it's so counter-intuitive to the Steven Demink we know.

We know that he's going to be held accountable for his actions today, judge. And no matter what happens, he's got a debt to pay.

I don't know that he could ever fully redeem himself, make people whole for the damage he's done no matter what he does for the rest of his life.

But because he's my brother, he's our friend, because he's a nephew, a son, an uncle, we're going to stand by him today.

We're not going forget everything good that he's done in his life today. We're not going to over look that, judge, and we want the Court to know that's the way we feel.

We believe him when he asks for help and recognizes he's needs help. Because he's our brother, judge, I believe that he can be rehabilitated. I believe that there is the potential to return him back where he can rejoin society, contribute again.

We all stand behind him and know he's got a debt to pay, judge. And while we don't want him to go away, we know he will. But the Court should know that we're going to be here with him when he returns.

So the only thing I can ask for today, judge, is a chance for Steve to redeem himself. The hope that one day he can return to his family, friends, begin to contribute to society, try to make right what is so obviously wrong about his conduct.

I'm asking the Court to consider a term of years with sexual offender rehabilitation treatment rather than a sentence of life, judge.

I thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Dinan. Mr. Mulcahy?

MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor.

As a procedural matter to start, I would like the Court to know that -- and I trust that the Court has received all of the victim impact letters?

THE COURT: I did.

MR. MULCAHY: There is, as we noted in our sentencing memorandum, there is one victim who's here today.

My intent would be to call her when the appropriate time is in my remarks, if that's okay with the Court or I can call her now.

THE COURT: I think it would be appropriate if you want to call her up. I'll be happy to hear from her.

I'll ask defendant and defense counsel to be seated.

MR. MULCAHY: Would you like that to happen now?

THE COURT: If you'd like to speak first, that's fine or if you'd like to call the victim first; either way you wish to proceed.

MR. MULCAHY: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. I'll think I'll call her in the middle of my remarks.

There's really only three things. We've filed a sentencing memorandum, it is lengthy, comprehensive. We stand by it. I won't repeat it for Your Honor nor will I read word for word all the victim impact letters. I know

Your Honor has.

THE COURT: I have.

MR. MULCAHY: However, there are three things.

And the first and foremost are about the victims in this case.

Because the victims are minors, these children, these innocent children, we try as best as we can after-the-fact to protect them, that's why we give them monikers such as Minor Victim 1, Minor Victim 2.

My concern not from the Court just generally - just in general is that MV1 through MV12 tends to take the humanity out of who these children are.

THE COURT: You needn't worry about that.

MR. MULCAHY: Thank you, Your Honor.

So what I -- and I trust that what I would like to do so I could adequately represent those 12 victims is just for a moment talk about what is unique about each one.

Because each one, although they all fell under this case, they all were sexually assaulted because of Mr. Demink's actions, they are unique.

And, for example, Minor Victim Number 1 is the oldest victim, he's 15 years old. What makes him unique in relation to the others is not just his age. He was asked to engage in the most widespread egregious of sexual assaults, if one could rank those things.

He was asked to participate in every capacity, in every imaginable definition of the term of elicit sexual conduct.

When is was all said and done, his mother was arrested.

This boy had to move across the country and I literally mean from one coast to the next and live with someone with whom he had a troubled relationship, his quardian now.

And so for his part Minor Victim Number 1 had his life obviously shook up in a unique way. His mother, Rebecca Nail, has been sentenced to 30 years in prison in federal prison.

THE COURT: I read her letter.

MR. MULCAHY: Thank you, Your Honor.

And the next victim in this case, Victims Number 2 and 3 are brother and sister out of Idaho.

Your Honor probably remembers Victim Number 2, this brave five year old little boy.

THE COURT: The one who went to the grandmother in Idaho?

MR. MULCAHY: I'll note Minor Victims 2 and 3 are the youngest of all of Mr. Demink's victims.

This boy's bravery led to the final person, perhaps ironically, to put a stop to Mr. Demink. His disclosure

led to this investigation and led to Mr. Demink's arrest.

And but for that boy's bravery, he'd still be -- Mr.

Demink would still be sexually assaulting children by

using and manipulating their mothers to this day.

He and his sister, as I indicated, they're the youngest victims. But I would note something important about Minor Victim Number 2. He's five years old, but he understands even at five that he was sexually assaulted.

The reason he told his grandmother what he told his grandmother is because his grandmother asked did you have good time with your mother and he said no. And he explained why.

So even at this young age, he understands that he's a victim of sexual assault and he will be forever.

Your Honor, as relates to Minor Victims 4 and 5, I know Your Honor has received a letter, in my opinion perhaps the most gut-wrenching letters from grandparents, that talk about the small community that they live in.

They talk about how these children had to change schools, the schools that their parents had gone to.

And --

THE COURT: I don't want to name names. Is this the letter dated July 20, 2011?

MR. MULCAHY: If I could have just one moment,
Your Honor? Yes, Your Honor. That is. That is the

letter.

It is perhaps the lengthiest letter. It speaks of a number of different things. I won't repeat them here.

But what stands out to me is this -- these children. The ripple affect of their abuse, their assaults had on this entire family.

And I suggest that although it's only articulated perhaps in that letter, every one of these victims and their families can tell a similar story of the ripple affects of Mr. Demink's actions and how they crushed and devastated that family.

For her part in this, unfortunately omitted from my sentencing memorandum, I indicated that Candice Miller, the mother of Minor Victims 4 and, 5 plead guilty to an indictment where she faces 15 to 30 years in prison for severity of child pornography counts.

She also is facing charges in the State of Florida, life charges that carry life sentences. I'm to assume if she plead guilty on the one, her chances of avoiding that significant sentence in the State of Florida are not good.

Your Honor, the Minor Victims 4 and 5, the one thing perhaps not completely unique to them, one thing is clear when we talk about Mr. Demink, we talk about what he's done, it is, obviously for its own self gratification. It obviously is a completely selfish act.

But just to underscore that, these two children were often woken up after they'd gone to bed at night, they were kept home from school all so they could produce the images that Mr. Demink so desperately wanted.

So while these might be the smallest of troubles or inconveniences that these children have to face, it underscores the fact that Mr. Demink was so insistent, so demanding of their mother, that nothing mattered.

He said you'd keep those kids home from school if they were sick. I'm telling you they are sick. They're sick because of the way you raise them and I can fix them.

So it didn't matter the time of day, the particular circumstances, it was what Mr. Demink wanted whenever he wanted.

Your Honor, that brings us to Minor Victims 6 and 7.

This time, with the Court's permission, I would like to ask their guardian to come forward, make an impact statement to the Court.

THE COURT: Do you wish to do this by question and answer or simply read a statement?

MR. MULCAHY: I believe she prefers to read a statement, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Could we have your name, please?

MS. HUGHES: Yes. My name is Trinity Hughes.

Forgive me.

I am the aunt and now legal guardian of -- do I have permission to use their names? My niece, Janelle, and my nephew Brandon, two sweet children who fell victims to Steven Demink at the hands of their own mother, my sister, Autumn.

Mr. Demink, you are like a pebble tossed into a pond. The affects of your self-serving, deceitful and immoral actions will ripple through the lives of not only my sister and her children, but the lives of their children as well.

My sister who is somehow a person I can barely recognize from her actions under your direction, as well as her self-preserving behavior she's displayed in the past ten months has already missed her son losing four baby teeth, last year's Halloween costume, Christmas, Easter, his 12th birthday.

Her daughter won four consecutive track races her first school year, her first ever. She had her 16th birthday. And she entered high school in two weeks. All of these small things are meant to be happy memories are tainted by you. The kids will always wonder would it be different if Mom was here.

My parents will not speak to or even mention my sister, their other daughter. The holidays last year were very difficult for every one. I know they will never be

the same again for any of us.

There will be awards, accomplishments, proms, graduation, first loves, marriages, her grandchildren that Jen and Brandon will not be able to share with their mother because she will most likely still be incarcerated well into their late 20's or early 30's.

When I think of all the times I share good and bad with my parents. I'm 32. I can't pretend that I can even imagine what hell has been going through their heads since the day you creeped into their lives.

I try to, but when I think of what must have been pure horror, confusion and fear they felt in their own home that day makes me sick.

How are they ever supposed to really feel safe again?

How are they ever to completely trust someone again; to

completely love without hesitation again. They were just

children.

Children are supposed to feel safe at home, save with their mother and enjoy the gifts of innocent naivete that we're all given for at least 18 brief years. You stole all of that from them.

I personally endured three years of almost daily abuse by the hands of a family friend. The damage done in those 1095 days is nothing compared to what one day of abuse by one of my parents would have done to me.

I cannot fathom what you or those seven women were thinking. Ten months ago without notice I had to put my own life on hold to put their lives back together. And I've been working diligently on that every day since.

I've not had the opportunity to have children of my own. I have been focusing on my career and higher education goals. Last fall in the State of Indiana, Department of Child Services placed my niece and nephew with me.

I was forced to withdraw from school at I.U. You see I'm no longer their aunt, I'm now their mother, father, tutor, therapist and everyone in between.

I'm just now finishing my bachelor's degree in a field that I never intended to major, at a school that I never intended to have as my alma mater, and at the time I already planned to be working towards my master's degree; all because of you, a man that I don't even know.

I had plans for my life. I had been building my life the way that I wanted it and you stole that from me, too.

No amount of apology or retribution will ever give back what you have taken from my the children, my sister, mother, brother, father, all of my extended family,

Janelle and Brandon's father's family and their future children who will not know grandma, only Aunt Trin.

So many lives will forever be altered and memories

tainted by your selfish acts.

How dare you. How dare you put your personal satisfaction above the well being of so many others, not just once but over and over and over again for what I can only assume was day after day after day.

Steven Demink, you are facing 15 years to life today.

And although I feel strongly that no one is beyond redemption, I have to hope you receive a life sentence because that is what you have given at least seven mothers, 12 children, and indirectly a vast unknown number of other people myself included.

Although today is the only time you and I will ever be in the same room together, your crimes will resonate for all the years of my life. That's all.

THE COURT: Thank you. Could I ask you -- ma'am?

MS. HUGHES: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Have you been in contact with your sister?

MS. HUGHES: I have. Your Honor, I'm actually the only person outside of church and counselors that acknowledges her. I feel I have to set an example for her children. I don't want to sway their decision to forgive or not for give in anyway. They know that. They've not spoken with her since her visits were revoked in April.

From the time I received them in October, she had 11 one-hour supervised visits before they revoked her visits.

So she hasn't -- she has a no contact order prior to that.

I did just get legal custody a couple weeks ago.

They know if and when they choose to visit her or speak to

They know if and when they choose to visit her or speak to her, I will respect that. It's totally up to them. She has a sentence or status hearing tomorrow morning, actually.

THE COURT: Has her case -- I believe she's in Indiana?

MS. HUGHES: Correct.

THE COURT: Has her case there been resolved yet?

MS. HUGHES: She has a status hearing tomorrow, I believe, to discuss the plea. If I have an opportunity to speak on behalf the children and myself, I will.

She's very fortunate. They're wonderful kids, huge hearts. And although they're angry and confused, their lives have been completely turned upside down, I know that they want to forgive and maybe they will.

Whether or not she's a part of their lives as adults again that's going to be completely up to them.

THE COURT: How are the kids doing?

MS. HUGHES: They're doing very well, Your Honor.

I'm proud to say that anyone that was involved in the case from the beginning now sees them today, they're

1 like two different children.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Are they getting some therapy?

MS. HUGHES: Yes, yes. Every week, as well as tutoring.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Mulcahy.

MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor. And I, I will try to be brief with the remainder of my remarks.

The, the remaining victims especially -- I know Your Honor's read the letter from the Victims 8 and 9; those are the two girls. Their father wrote a letter on their behalf.

THE COURT: I got that letter.

MR. MULCAHY: And he --

THE COURT: I think it was the only father I received a letter from.

MR. MULCAHY: That's correct, Your Honor.

In many cases the fathers are involved in these children's lives.

THE COURT: I gathered that; sort of why the mothers were on singleparentmeet.com.

MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor. But many don't even have visitation or interest in visitation.

What I'd like to say about those two couldn't do justice to their father's letter, but I would note that he

focuses on a couple of things perhaps different then the others, which are his girls leave him in almost a Catch-22.

They don't want the door shut to go to sleep for fear for of a camera. They don't want the door open to go to sleep for fear someone will come in. Their lives have been invaded once, they don't know if it will happen again. That father's anguish is palpable in that letter.

One of the thing he says is sleepovers are something my girls are going to miss out on and talks about the anguish he has of trying to decide who can you trust who could you not trust. After all, it was within the care of their own mom mother that his children were victimized at Mr. Demink's behest.

Minor Victims 10 and 11 lead us to a different situation, Your Honor, out of Georgia. Minor Victim Number 10 was perhaps Mr. Demink's most difficult challenge.

That teenage girl there challenged Mr. Demink through her mother to say why is this. Why do I need to have these photographs taken of myself.

In fact, after the first round of photographs she says I feel like I've been molested already, which Mr. Demink takes over.

He brings her to the computer and says bring her,

Minor Victim 10 on the computer.

When he does, he learns very quickly what motivates that young girl getting out of her current situation. She was not happy with the town or the residence that they lived in.

And Mr. Demink seized on it immediately said all you need to do are these things and I will take you away. You will come to Tampa, you will have a new life and he promises a new and better life to convince her.

And if that weren't bad enough, her friend just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time, Minor Victim Number 11.

THE COURT: I think I got a letter from her mother.

MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor. And her mother talks about the -- as I read her letter, although it's just in words, it reads as written by someone who is stunned, stunned that this could have happened.

Stunned that this man could have infiltrated her life. She never heard of this man. She was the only mother who wasn't involved here.

What makes Minor Victim 11 perhaps, perhaps the most sympathetic is when she says -- excuse me, when Minor Victim 10 Charity Holloway says we cannot involve Minor Victim 11, she's been sexually assaulted before, Mr.

Demink's seizes on that. He seizes upon that and he grips a hold of it very tightly and he says all the more reason she needs to be part of this. I can fix her.

It was some more threats and more convincing. There goes Minor Victim 11 sexually assaulted for a second time in her life.

So it's not something where after-the-fact Mr. Demink who couldn't possibly have known she was a prior victim. He knew it and he used it.

The last -- I would note this did not make it in my sentencing memorandum. Charity Holloway faces both state and federal charges. Those are recent. I don't believe they've been resolved.

That brings us to Minor Victim Number 12. I indicated number 11 might be the most sympathetic.

THE COURT: Is this the young man who's autistic?

MR. MULCAHEY: Yes, Your Honor. I think he rivals
in sympathy, perhaps surpasses.

Victim Number 12. Here's a boy who by the age of 12 cannot talk, cannot use the bathroom, he wears diapers and, in fact, completely and wholly dependent on his mother.

Again, another situation where Mr. Demink knows it, learns it and uses it to sexually exploit that boy.

He says he will never ever experience a woman's

touch. It is your job to make this happen.

He trades and pounces on her desire and I'm sure her anxiety to be a good mother to a boy with special needs, seizes on it and exploits it, uses it and for his own sexual gratification.

THE COURT: Apparently, he's now living with the grandparents?

MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think I received a letter from the grandfather.

MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor, there was a letter submitted by the grandfather.

And I -- I will say on that letter there was some frustration to say the least that the grandparents' lives have been turned upside down.

Ms. Hughes is a remarkable human being for what she's been able to do, how she put her life aside and put her life on hold for those children.

But these other parents and grandparents, excuse me, grandparents and aunts, uncles, other guardians oftentimes have been less than excited, very frustrated, very angry that they've had to put their lives on hold.

This boy, Minor Victim 12's grandparents are 69 and 70 years of age. They've earned their retirement, they've raised their children. Now they are thrust back into

raising a boy and not just anybody, but actually two boys, but a boy with special needs. Their frustration's palpable.

In their letter I note another point about more things about Minor Victim 12. He is -- he and his brother now live with their grandparents.

You see, their father died two or three years ago. We know this because Deborah Fisher, their mother, told Mr. Demink that in a chat, in fact, in the very first chat they ever met.

So when Mr. Demink not only seizes on the fact that this boy's autistic and severely autistic, severely limited, he seizes on the fact they don't have a Dad, not don't have a Dad that's not interested, maybe a Dad got problems with Mom, they have a father whose deceased.

Now look at these two children being raised by their grandparents. In the span of three years, their father has died, their mother is going to jail and has no contact.

To state that their lives have basically exploded in front of the home would be an understatement. He knew every detail of it and didn't care.

What that means -- and the last thing Minor Victim

Number 12, he depended on his mother for everything.

And 69 an 70 aren't what they used to be. 69 and

70 -- they still have many years ahead of them, but there's a pretty good chance that this boy, Minor Victim 12, as he gets into his 20's and 30's, he's going have to go to a home.

Those grandparents aren't going outlive him, he's going to a home. He wouldn't have gone to a home if it wasn't for him. The mother would take care of him since the day he was born.

I had one more notion --

THE COURT: Has Deborah Fisher been convicted and sentenced?

MR. MULCAHY: Her trial is in October. She's not been convicted.

THE COURT: How much time is she facing?

MR. MULCAHY: I don't have those. I'm sorry,

Judge. I'm not sure. I know she's only -- she's only

charged in the state, she's not charged in both

jurisdictions.

You know, I had a note about what all of them share in common, but Ms. Hughes said it better then I did or that I could when it comes to what these parents have missed out on.

And these mother are not victims by any stretch, but they certainly were manipulated by this man. They certainly made their choices, but their choices came --

were presented to them by him.

And so what these mothers will miss out on Ms. Hughes said it best, all of the birthdays and track meets, everything that comes with it. But there's something else here, too.

Every one of these children -- what's common among all of them is they're going to have to have conversations. He has forced them to have conversations that nobody should have.

When he goes to college, he's got a roommate.

Where's your Mom. Is your Mom coming up? When the boys and girls grow up and they decide they found someone they may want to date or marry, the conversation of where's your mother?

When they have children, those children don't get to have grandma, it's because of him. They have that commonality all of them.

They're going to have to have hard conversations, embarrassing, humiliating conversations with the rest of their lives to anybody they care about.

The second thing -- I told you I'd only talk about three things, I'll be much shorter. The second is just a response to Mr. Demink's pleas for a lesser sentence then life.

As for his own criminal history, that's true he has

no criminal convictions. He's spent nine years collecting child pornography. This Court has seen a lot of child pornography cases.

To watch and look for child pornography, it would take a reasonable person -- it would hit them right in the gut, it does every time, no matter how many times you see them.

This man collected it for the better part of a decade. Every night when he put his head on the pillow, every morning when he woke up from it, he knew he was committing a crime. To say that he has no criminal history is unimpressive.

And I'd also note that that nine year span that comes from his admissions, comes from the admissions of a man who, by Dr. Miller's report, has a hard time or refuses to talk about his sexual interest in children.

I suggest that a man with his history of manipulation and a man who won't talk about the very reason he's here, can't be trusted to limit it to nine years.

THE COURT: Let me ask you to address this question.

How should the Court evaluate and come into a sentence Mr. Demink's possible potential for rehabilitation as against the other sentencing factors?

MR. MULCAHY: I do not think it helps him to get a

sentence less than life for this reason.

He has told Dr. Miller -- Dr. Miller's report, excuse me, reads that Mr. Demink, besides being immature and self indulgent, has had a resistance to or a flat out refusal to address the sexual interest in children. He clearly has.

How can he rehabilitate himself if he can't be honest with himself about his desires to watching and having sexual assaults performed on children?

My suggestion is he's not a great candidate with rehabilitation because the reason is he won't even admit his own sexual interest in children, despite the decade of collecting child pornography and horrific crimes we're talking about here today.

I'd also note something else which should give this Court pause. Even if he were more open and honest, Dr. Miller's report on page 17 says and I quote:

Mr. Demink's highly unusual and unique methods and the results achieved simply do not fit readily within existing sex offender classifications.

I could not agree more. He is a man. Unique in fact outside this, outside this courtroom is a history of this very room and some of the pillars and other things that are in here.

This room has seen 115 years of folks coming in and out. I suggest to the Court it's never seen someone like Mr. Demink, the ability that he had to manipulate people and get what he wants. So I don't think he's a good a candidate for rehabilitation.

Which actually leads me to another issue that I think he has offered for something which is that he never himself laid a hand on a child.

Our response to that is, first, he directed like a movie director, the chapter put some extras in there exactly what he wanted to happen. The sex acts he wanted, the lighting he chose, the positions of those children.

And as I said earlier when he wanted it to happen. Even had the wherewithal or the gall to comment on their failure to smile during these sexual assaults. Next time smile, both of you.

So that he didn't lay a finger on these children, he was the puppet master. Those mothers were his puppets.

It's a distinction without a difference.

And I also suggest that makes him more dangerous. If The Internet provides the kind of access to children that Mr. Demink used today, what's he going do when he's out of custody?

What kind of technological advances will he be able to exploit to get after kids then. I can't think of them.

I'd also note that for the victims in this case, the fact that Mr. Demink did not lay a hand on those children would give them no solace.

It's probably worse for them, for these victims, because when they could tell a friend, a colleague, that they could tell a potential spouse, hey, I was sexually assaulted by a pedophile, by a predator.

But they have to have a conversation that said I was sexually assaulted by my mother because of a predator; that's a way horrible conversation.

The last thing I'll say in response to some of the issues that are set forth or some of the reasons set forth for a lesser sentence by Mr. Demink or all those letters.

They're a lot of letters, they're a lot of people who support Mr. Demink. My quarrel is not with them, it's not with his family and it's not with his friends.

What I suggest -- I mean with all due respect to them, they seem all universally like good people. But Mr. Demink was able to manipulate other people, other mothers, excuse me, other human beings, to violate the most sacred bond that nature has ever made between a mother and a child. That bond -- there's nothing stronger.

He convinced without ever meeting them face to face, to break it. He manipulated them to destroy it. And if he could do that to them, all he'd have to do to

manipulate his friends and family is to convince them he's not a monster. That's easy. I would say that's been feeding his manipulation skills.

I don't doubt they all believe the letters they wrote, but they're writing a letter about a different guy, not writing about this guy. It's a different guy. They don't know him.

The fact that Mr. Demink says he has some remorse and feelings. A lot of letters talk about this. I believe he has remorse for his victims. He had opportunities to save kids.

He had opportunities when the agents came knocking at his door. They didn't knock on his door and say we think you might have child porn, so he might say I better not confess to the worst conduct. They showed him chat logs.

Here's a mother in Idaho. She says you ordered her to sexually assault her kids. We believe it because we have this chat log. He admitted to that one. He admitted to two more.

But when bugged by the agents practically where they said tell us about any more, because they knew, they knew there were kids out there to be saved. He didn't come clean.

Real remorse doesn't come on a piece of paper. Real remorse comes with action, action that could save some

kids. Taking the people who were sexually assaulted out of their homes; we didn't get his help.

I would also note for his lack of remorse, they're other identities Mr. Demink has had. I talked very briefly about this in our sentencing memorandum, other identities.

What we've had is the principal identity that he used, but there's others. We know of others and he knows what we know about others.

The last thing I want to say, judge -- this is my final part, I promise. I just want to wrap up by saying we ask for a life sentence in this case, but we don't do it lightly. We don't ask for a life sentence, we are parroting to you what the guidelines call for.

The guidelines do call for life; they do for reasons separate and apart for why child pornography guideline sentences get criticized.

They're so high in this case because of the number of victims, the number of assaults, the ages of the victims and the production -- the fact there was images produced as opposed to merely traded.

We, ask for life and we think the guidelines are right on this because no other term of years makes any sense.

If Your Honor gave five years in jail to Mr. Demink

for every child that was sexually assaulted because of his selfish conduct, that's 60 years. Five years would be insulting to them, in the government's opinion.

If Your Honor gave him the minimum mandatory, which is 15 years for each child, it's 180 years. It's life.

The reason the guidelines call for life is because against this conduct, this unique conduct, the guidelines call for life because life is the sentence here. We ask for it. We don't do it lightly and we ask for it.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Dinan, I don't know if you wish to present anything else to the Court before I hear from Mr. Demink?

MR. DINAN: I have nothing else for the Court, judge, but my client would like to say something to the Court. May we approach?

THE COURT: Please.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I just want to say to the victims and their families that I am sorry from the bottom of my heart. And I did not think of what consequences that my actions were going to produce.

And I've had ten months to think about what I've done and the consequences that have happened. And I hope they can find it in their heart one day to forgive me for what I have done.

I need help and I want help. I will take any training, therapy, programs, any kind of education that the government is willing to let me have. And I'm going to every day for the rest of my life try to atone and rectify what I've done.

I would also like to thank my family and friends for being here today and basically showing me support that I don't really deserve.

And I do want to apologize to them, also, for what I put them through. Thank you.

THE COURT: You said that you weren't thinking of the impact on these children. What were you thinking of?

THE DEFENDANT: I really don't know, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Its --

THE DEFENDANT: I was selfish. I wasn't -- I wasn't thinking of anyone but myself.

THE COURT: As I read through the documents, transcripts, the letters, it seems to me like this became an obsession for you.

Over time, you seemed to have become obsessed by the use of The Internet and the manipulation of other people that you were able to achieve through The Internet.

Did you feel like you were so compulsively, compulsively compelled to do this that you could just not

stop?

THE DEFENDANT: I wouldn't say I was compelled, but I think I was using it to mask my own heart and basically living a vicarious life that was amassing deeper, deeper issues.

THE COURT: Well, we all have sort of Walter Minny dreams we'd like to live out. But this went far, far beyond that.

This appeared to me, after reading everything that was presented to me by both your attorney, the letter from your family and friends and the government, that this was a became a very deep-seeded obsession.

I ask these questions because I think we're all struggling to find an answer here on a number of different levels.

One level is what could possibly have possessed you to do something like this over such a long prolonged period of time, on one level.

And a second level is the level that Mr. Mulcahy addressed, the level that Dr. Miller attempted to address as well. What possibility is there that if I don't give you a life sentence, you'll be able to rehabilitate yourself and not fall prey to the same kind of obsessive/compulsive behavior that brings you here today?

They're two sets of questions that, as I sort of

struggle through his case, I think I need to try to answer. I don't know if you can answer them. I don't know if you've even thought about that.

THE DEFENDANT: I think about it every day, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So the first question is what do you think possessed you to do this in the first place?

THE DEFENDANT: I think that I didn't like myself so much that it basically took away all empathy I could feel. Why that particular path came about, I don't know; I'm struggling with that. But I just think I had issues that were inside me that I didn't face and they basically came out in a bad way.

I think, like I said, I just didn't bother to see the affect of what I was doing, but I do see it now and it's something I'll live with for the rest of my life and never forget. I also know it's never going to happen again.

THE COURT: The government argues to me as you've heard you're not a likely candidate for rehabilitation. What can you tell me about that?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't agree with that opinion.

THE COURT: The government tells me that one of the indicia of why you're not a candidate for rehabilitation is that you, today, even to this day, are not able to discuss your obsession with young

children and child pornography. That doesn't -- I do think the government's correct about that. If it's true, it doesn't bode well for rehabilitation.

The first step in rehabilitation for any sort of psychological impairment is to step away from denial and to confront it.

MR. DINAN: Your Honor, the only thing I'd want to add is in Dr. Miller's report in the footnote --

THE COURT: I saw that.

MR. DINAN: -- it's, it's a matter of shame, judge, as it is a matter of difficulty talking about it.

THE COURT: Mr. Dinan, that's Dr. Miller. I want to hear from your client.

MR. DINAN: I understand, judge.

THE COURT: You know, lawyers and doctors say a lot of things after.

MR. DINAN: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I've had a lot more time on the bench then I'd even like to recognize. I have to say that they're some cases in which lawyers and doctors can only have so much influence on a judge.

MR. DINAN: I understand, judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Demink, my question is that if you really are not able to confront the root and core of

your illness, what prospect is there for rehabilitation?

THE DEFENDANT: I think we have made a lot of steps towards that. I think if we had more time to speak, that report probably would have been a little more in depth.

I think I have come to a lot of conclusions and opened up to a lot of what my problems were. And it's nothing that I -- it's just the progression that it took. We had four, five hours, we've talked about a lot of, things.

And at this point, I don't want to hold back anything. I'm not holding back anything and further talks will show that.

THE COURT: My hunch is that your -- it's more than a hunch.

I think it's after having had many of these cases over the years, my educated estimation is that your obsession with child, child pornography has gone on for a long time, long before it manifested itself in the conduct which now brings you here. And I'm concerned that you're not and have not been able to address that or to face it.

The only therapy that could possibly be effective on a long term basis is the kind of therapy in which a person fully and completely faces the full extent of their

problems. Otherwise, it's just treating -- therapy's just treating the symptoms. So I'm concerned about your prospects for rehabilitation, I really am.

Sentencing is a process. It's a -- it's a difficult, challenging process of trying -- the Court trying to weigh all of the different considerations.

Because I think every judge is -- I know that I am humanly aware of the implication of a sentence, particularly a lengthy sentence and especially a life sentence, not just for the person who's being sentenced, the defendant in front of the court, but for the defendant's families.

I get -- this is something you folks probably don't see, but I get dozens and dozens of letters not only from the defendants that I've sentenced, but from their family members.

And you would have to be a pretty cold-hearted human being not to recognize the devastation that a lengthy sentence brings to the family of the defendant who's been sentenced.

But in a case like this, that devastation probably pails in comparison to the devastation that has been reeked upon the victims and their families.

So as I try to weigh out the conflicting elements of a sentence here, the question of whether the defendant may

realistically be rehabilitated is an important one.

I have to say I appreciate Dr. Miller's report, I found it helpful on a lot of different levels, but I didn't find it very helpful on this issue of rehabilitation.

If you wish to address any of those issues, Mr.

Demink, I want to give you a full opportunity to do it.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I, I know you've heard a lot today that paints me in a light that makes it difficult for you to basically render your verdict, (sic) but from the bottom of my heart I know -- and this sounds slightly to almost say this.

I did not mean to hurt people. I know I did and I know I have issues I need to address, but I am not unsalvageable. I'm not someone that you can throw away and not ever hear from again.

Despite all that's happened, I think I still have value, I still think I can be a productive member of society without the Court worrying about me reoffending.

I know you've seen a lot of things that point you in the other direction, but I just know how I live my life.

I'll get to the why things happen eventually, I know that.

But I also I know that I lived my life not trying to hurt people.

I know that the prosecution has said -- has painted

that. But I do feel, I do feel sickened by what's going to happen to the victims, what's going to happen with the rest of their lives. I know I had a big part of that.

But I also know, given a chance, that will never happen again. I know it from the bottom of my heart. I just ask to you give my that chance.

THE COURT: I'd like to take just a minute to read a letter from your sister, okay?

(After a short delay,

the proceedings continued)

THE COURT: As I said to Mr. Demink, sentencing is the hardest thing any judge does. But even having said that, some sentences are more difficult then others and this is one of those sentences.

Because it calls into question some pretty basic things; such as how well do we really ever know someone, what are the balancing and competing factors in a person's life when there is much that is good to recommend somebody, but that that person has done indescribably abhorrent, despicable and incredibly damaging acts that have had a devastating affect upon other people.

As I said, there's some cases in which lawyers and doctors just really can only help a court so much.

And at this point I want to pause and say that I think that both counsel for the government and for Mr.

Demink, have done an outstanding job in representing, in Mr. Dinan's case, his client and in Mr. Mulcahy's case, the victims.

The sentencing memorandums were truly outstanding. I read every word of both memorandum and every letter that was presented to me.

But, unfortunately, this is one of those cases that the lawyers can only help so much; and in some ways, their excellent advocacy has not made my job easier but, rather, more difficult as I try to balance all of the competing factors that I have to balance in coming to a just and appropriate sentence under the law.

There are so many tragedies that have spawned out from Mr. Demink's virtually daily sessions on his computer that it's hard to, it's hard to calculate the butcher's toll.

Whether we start with the victims, the children. And I accept every word in the letters without absolving the mothers who obviously have their own demons they'll have to contend with, to the letters I've received from Mr. Demink's parents. I don't know if they're in the courtroom.

MR. DINAN: They are.

THE COURT: I appreciated the letters that helped me understand Mr. Demink, the letter from his sister

that I've just read now, from his friends.

I've been reading these letters as I said for a very long time from defendants and I think I can tell letters that are the product of an orchestrated campaign by the lawyer and the letters that are truly heart felt. And I think the letters that I received from Mr. Demink's family and friends are truly heart felt.

As I read them, I just kept thinking how well do we ever really know someone. I can only imagine if one of my siblings or a family member or a friend close friend were charged with and sitting now where Mr. Demink is sitting, what my reaction would be based upon the relationship that I've had with them.

I would probably begun to question how well I really
-- how well I really did know that person. So that's a
question that's almost insoluble here.

Another tragedy is Mr. Demink himself. I realize that he is the perpetrator here and I don't diminish in the least the heinousness of his crimes and the impact on the victims. But his conduct is, obviously, the product of a sick mind that simply controlled him to an extent that he could not function rationally.

The nature and the tenure of his communications with these mothers was not simply communication that was suggesting or requesting.

There was a very, very clear obsessive quality to it that drove him to be so insistent and persistent and to manipulate the very vulnerabilities of these women to commit these hideous acts that they committed on their children. And I think probably even manipulated the children themselves in a certain way in those instances in which he was in direct contact with them.

The hardest question to answer is what are the prospects for rehabilitation for Mr. Demink. As I said, I didn't -- I found, I found Dr. Miller's report to be helpful on some levels, but ultimately elusive on the most critical question for me, which is the prospects for and potential for Mr. Demink to truly be rehabilitated.

I sometimes wish in sentencing in these kinds of cases, I can do them progressively so that I would have a chance to see how a defendant was progressing with therapy.

But, unfortunately, sentencing has to be completely prospective by its nature and can't be, can't be done on a continuous basis.

The judge has to be able to make his or her best decision with the information they have at the time and hope that he or she made the best call possible.

When I look at this case, I think the overriding consideration has to be the focus on the children that

were victims here.

Every one of these children were truly innocent victims, every one of them. And they were victims not only at the time that Mr. Demink was perpetrating these crimes, but the vast majority of them will no doubt be victims for the rest of their lives.

They've not only had their childhood stolen from them, but many of them will certainly have their adult years stolen from them in very significant ways.

They will, no doubt, find it difficult to form relationships, they will, no doubt have nightmares, they will be deprived of parental guidance; given some of these mothers that may not be a bad thing, but even, even these mothers clearly cared about their children.

They were misguided, they were sick themselves. But some of these mothers were doing what they did because they bought into Mr. Demink's manipulative urgings and believed him, believed that what they were doing was in some bizarre way good for the children. And every one of these children, every one of them will be deprived of a parenteral relationship.

When I look at the impact and the devastation that has been reeked through the use of The Internet by Mr. Demink, it's almost inconceivable the breadth and the length of the toll that his conduct will have.

Who knows where these kids will go. Who knows how their lives will be impacted down the road.

Fortunately, some them are in good hands and beginning the healing process, such as the two children that our witness here spoke about. But even those kids will no doubt be impacted. Others may be just cut a drift with no mother provide for them, maybe no grandparents, no siblings of the mother. Some of these children may end up as wards of the State.

And I think I would be remiss if I didn't, in fashioning a sentence, keep a great deal of focus upon the children.

That doesn't mean I've lost focus on you, Mr. Demink.

I've spent a lot of time thinking about you and reading

the letters from your friends and your family.

And as Mr. Dinan said, it's almost as if they're two people there; the person who always stood up for the underdog, the person who's kind and gentle, tried to help his friends and neighbors and his family, the person who is always there to help homeless families and neighbors, elderly neighbors.

And maybe on some level you were trying to compensate for the other person that you may be even at some level couldn't control.

But when I add it all up, I'm very, very reticent to

be able to find that there's much prospect for the kind of rehabilitation that would be truly effective to be able to permit Mr. Demink to return to his family and the community to live any sort of normal, productive life.

The prospect of a life sentence is a daunting prospect for any judge, at least it should be. It's not one that any judge faces easily.

But as I look at the devastation that has been reeked on so many lives, I'm afraid I have to conclude that this is a case that justifies a life sentence, as difficult as that is.

In the matter of the United States of America versus Stephen Demink, criminal docket 10-20676, with respect to the counts of conviction here, Counts Two, Three, Six, Seven, Ten and Eleven, after considering the sentencing guidelines and the factors contained in the sentencing statute, as well as those factors which the Court has discussed here and counsel have discussed here and Mr. Demink discussed here on the record, it is the judgment of this Court that the defendant be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 360 months on Counts Two, Six and Ten to run concurrent with each other.

And that with respect to Counts Three, Seven and Eleven, it's the judgment of this Court that the defendant be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to

serve a life term.

The life term on these counts will run concurrent with each other as well as concurrent to the sentence imposed as to Counts Two, Six and Ten.

I'm going to recommend very strongly to the Bureau of Prisons that the defendant be committed to the Bureau of Prisons Residential Sex Offender Treatment Program at Devens and I hope that the Bureau of Prisons will follow the Court's recommendation. The Devens facility is known as one of the very best within the federal correction community in this area.

The law requires a special assessment of \$100 for each count of conviction. They're six counts of conviction, therefore, a special assessment of \$600 is due and payable immediately.

I have waived the imposition of a fine or costs of incarceration, costs of supervision, due to the defendant's lack of resources.

In the event that for some reason that Mr. Demink does not serve a full term of life, he will be placed on a term of supervised release for life as to all six counts and on each of these counts, the supervised release term will run concurrent.

Mr. Demink does not have a serious long-standing problem of substance abuse, but he did have some substance

abuse issues, therefore, I have to impose the mandatory drug testing condition. Therefore, I do impose it.

Should he be on supervision, he will abide by all of the standard conditions of supervised release which have been adopted by this Court as well as the following additional conditions mandated by law.

He will comply with the requirements of the Sex

Offender Registration Notification Act as directed by his

probation officer, the United States Bureau of Prisons or

any state offender registration agency in which he

resides, works or is a student or was convicted of any

other offense.

He will successfully complete any sex offender diagnostic evaluations, treatment or counseling programs and polygraph examinations as directed by his probation officer.

Reports pertaining to sex offender assessments, treatment and polygraph examinations shall all be provided to his probation officer.

Based upon the defendant's ability to pay, he will pay the costs of these evaluations, treatments and counseling programs and polygraph examinations in an amount to be determined by his probation officer.

He will not associate with minor children under the age of 18 except in the presence of a responsible adult

who is aware of the nature of his background and his convictions here and who has been approved by his probation officer.

He will not frequent places where children congregate on a regular basis such as schools, playgrounds, children's toy stores, video arcades, places of that nature.

He must notify anyone that he would ultimately date or marry who has minor children -- a minor child or children under the age of 18 of his conviction and the nature of it.

He will not purchase, sell, view or possess images in any form of media or live venue that depict pornography, sexually explicit conduct, child erotica or child nudity.

He will not patronize any place where this material is available or such entertainment is available.

He will provide his probation officer with accurate information about all computer systems that he has, including all passwords and any Internet service providers that he has the potential and reasonable access to, and abide by all of the rules of the Probation Department's computer monitoring programs.

He will only access a computer that has been approved by his probation officer.

He will consent to his probation officer conducting periodic unannounced examinations of all computer systems which may include computer monitoring software at his expense.

For the purpose of accounting for all computers' hardware, software and accessories, he will submit his or her person, his residence, computer, and/or his vehicle to a search conducted by his probation officer at reasonable times and places and reasonable manners.

He will inform any other residents that the premises and his computer may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

And he will provide his probation officer with access to any requested financial information, including billing records, telephone records, cable records, Internet records, satellite records and anything of the nature in the future that we can't predict.

He will have employment preapproved by his probation officer. If his employment requires the regular use of a computer, he will notify his employer of the nature of his conviction and this notification must be confirmed by his probation officer.

He will only access The Internet through one Internet capable device. All other Internet capable devices such as cellular phones, gaming consoles shall not have the

Internet connected.

He is prohibited from access to any online computer service at any location, including but not limited to public libraries, Internet cafes, places of employment or education without the permission of his probation officer.

He will not own on or possess a camera, photographic device, and/or equipment, including video recording equipment and including cell phones with photographic capability without the prior approval of his probation officer.

And, finally, he will not rent a P.O. box or storage unit without the prior approval of his probation officer.

Mr. Demink, under the terms of your plea agreement you agreed that if I were to accept your plea agreement and sentence you within the guidelines that were anticipated in the plea agreement, that you would waive or give up any right that you would have to appeal either your conviction or your sentence.

I've now accepted the plea agreement and have sentenced you in accordance with the plea agreement and, therefore, you do not have a right to appeal your conviction or your sentence.

Is there anything else from counsel --

MR. MULCAHY: Your Honor, excuse me. Two matters.

THE COURT: -- concerning either the sentence I've imposed or anything else?

MR. MULCAHEY: Your Honor, they're two matters. First, there is the restitution issue to be paid. I do have --

THE COURT: I was going to ask if you wanted a separate hearing on that. You didn't present anything during your presentation.

MR. MULCAHY: I would like an opportunity to brief the Court on I believe a couple of outstanding issues regarding restitution. I've provided one example to the Court, but I'd like to provide another to Mr. Dinan at a later time.

If Your Honor would like a hearing, we could have one at a later time.

THE COURT: Well I think we should have a hearing on it if it's necessary.

My question to you is what is the realistic prospect now given the sentence?

MR. MULCAHY: Not great. I understand that.

I would like an opportunity to research that issue and whether or not under Crime Victim's Rights Act I'm advocating on their behalf correctly if I say it's uncollectible. If I think it's uncollectible, if I could have an opportunity.

THE COURT: The one thing -- I would want to put all my cards on the table here. I would not be amenable to anybody other than Mr. Demink be responsible for restitution, certainly not his family.

MR. MULCAHY: I understand that, that wasn't my suggestion if that's what the Court thought.

It was more of the issue of properly presenting to the Court an order for restitution so that I adequately explain to all the victims what they're entitled to under the Crime Victim's Rights Act. If that's an order that can't happen because the defendant is unable to pay, so be it.

I wanted to provide that to the Court perhaps in two weeks, if that's agreeable.

THE COURT: Mr. Dinan?

MR. DINAN: Your Honor, it seems a moot point given the life term the Court set forth. But if the government insists on pursuing this issue of restitution, I would like an opportunity to respond to that.

THE COURT: Let's leave it that way, then. Mr. Mulcahy, you can present to the Court any material, including any briefs for restitution that you wish and Mr. Dinan will have an opportunity to respond.

Sentence Hearing 8-3-2011 1 I generally don't like to enter pyric orders, so I 2 think should all be cognizant of that. 3 MR. MULCAHY: I understand, Your Honor. THE COURT: I certainly want you to address that 4 5 issue. MR. MULCAHY: Absolutely. I will. I will talk to 6 7 Mr. Dinan beforehand before I file anything. Because that issue, what Your Honor just pointed out, may 8 9 resolve any dispute we have. The second procedural issue is because Your Honor's 10 11 accepted the terms of the plea agreement, the government's moving to dismiss the remaining counts of the Indictment 12 13 against this defendant. 14 THE COURT: Provide me with a proposed order, 15 please. 16 MR. MULCAHY: Yes, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Anything else from the defense? 18 MR. DINAN: No, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Thank you all. 20 (This hearing then 21 22

concluded at 2:55 p.m.)

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from reported proceedings in the above-entitled matter. s/Carol S. Sapala, FCRR, RMR December 21, 2011 Usa v Demink 10-20676